OCT 93 2016

EPA-REGION 10

August 15, 2016

U.S. EPA ATTN: Harbor Comments 805 SW Broadway, Suite 500 Portland, OR 97205

The current proposal from the EPA aimed at cleaning hazardous chemicals from the Willamette River will ruin the economy of this local area. Just based on projections of tourism, the riverfront is an area heavily used by tourists. Turning it into a construction site will shut down the tourism economy. In addition, ships that use that channel will be forced to stay away from river, which would also hurt the shipping industry. The ripple effect will be a loss of jobs, more homeless people on the streets, neighborhoods would see people moving out of their homes and real estate prices will go down. All this while the economy is still not fully recovered from the last downturn. Lots of people are still unemployed. Instead of doing something that will drive people away, we need more industry and jobs available to bring the economy back.

I oppose the EPA proposal because it will only do more harm by contaminating the water when the river is diluting itself under a natural process. We could spend that money on education reform, or improve housing and restrict adding additional costs that discourage affordable housing in the city. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineer's plan to start with a less aggressive method is a better way to go instead of further polluting the river and shutting down recreational facilities in the harbor.

I'm very skeptical of the scientific data from 2004 that is being used to justify making a radical change to downtown. The government should get out of it and let the private sector clean it up. Surely, a less costly, less invasive plan is better pushing to have a certain group of people working on this sort of thing. I'm retired on a fixed income and my utilities are already higher here than when I moved from California. After living here for 22 years, I will most likely move out of the area if my taxes go up to pay for this.

No one is suggesting to leave the river in bad shape, but vast improvements are already being made. What we want to see is more consideration of other proposals that utilize less dredging and are lower cost and more input from local residents. Doing one or both before this is approved removes the possibility of misuse.

	Sinc	erel	у,		
(b)	(6)				